

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Japanese Laid-Open Patent Application Number 2000-128031 to Satoshi ("Satoshi") in view of Katta (US Pub. 2004/0085447) ("Katta") and U.S. Patent Number 4,420,238 to Felix ("Felix"). Claims 12-14 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Satoshi, Katta, and Felix, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,772,942 to Tuck ("Tuck"). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Satoshi, Katta, and Felix, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,314,364 to Nakamura ("Nakamura"). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Satoshi, Katta, and Felix, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,891,563 to Schofield et al. ("Schofield") and U.S. Patent Number 6,422,062 to King et al. ("King"). Applicants do not agree with or acquiesce to any of these claim rejections, but applicants hereby further amend independent claim 1 to move this application to allowance as soon as possible.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, a perspective image which is panned or tilted. The perspective image is derived from an image with an omniazimuth view field area therearound, and that image is obtained by at least one omniazimuth visual sensor that is stationary with respect to a mobile body. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in the original application at, for example, page 41, line 1 to page 46, line 21.

Satoshi may disclose that an image of a 360 degree viewfield is captured by a camera from a hyperbolic mirror. But, Satoshi at least fails to teach or suggest that a perspective image derived from that 360 degree viewfield is panned or tilted.

Felix may disclose that an image is panned or tilted, but Felix at least fails to teach or suggest panning or tilting a perspective image derived from a 360 degree viewfield or how that image is obtained by at least one omniazimuth visual sensor that is stationary with respect to a mobile body.

Each of Satoshi and Felix fails to teach or suggest at least panning or tilting of a perspective image where that image is derived from an image with an omniazimuth view field area therearound or how that image is obtained by at least one omniazimuth visual sensor that is stationary with respect to a mobile body. Thus the combination of these two references would not have resulted in at least those aspects of independent claim 1.

Also, at cols. 3 and 4 (particularly col. 4, lines 18-34), Felix indicates that panning and tilting of a captured image is achieved as a result of a mechanical or physical movement of a camera. Satoshi does not disclose moving a camera. Satoshi indicates that the camera and the mirror should be aligned. See, for example, the abstract of Satoshi and also paragraph [0087] of Satoshi. Felix and Satoshi thus are at odds with respect to moving the camera. One of ordinary skill would not have modified Satoshi to allow camera movement as disclosed in Felix because that would have rendered the system of Satoshi unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. If the camera in Satoshi is moved to pan or tilt, then the required alignment with the mirror will be lost.

Katta at least fails to teach or suggest these same aspects of amended independent claim 1, and thus Katta adds nothing in this regard if combined with Satoshi and/or Felix. Applicants thus submit that the combination of Satoshi, Felix, and Katta would not have resulted in at least these aspects of amended independent claim 1. Consequently, amended claim 1 and all of the other claims which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 are patentable over any combination of Satoshi, Katta, and Felix.

As for the rejections of various dependent claims over the Satoshi/Katta/Felix combination and one or more of Tuck, Nakamura, Schofield, and King, applicants traverse those dependent claim rejections as well. None of Tuck, Nakamura, Schofield, and King teaches or suggests panning or tilting of a perspective image where that perspective image is derived from an image with an omniazimuth view field area therearound. Given this, no

combination of any of these seven references (i.e., Satoshi, Katta, Felix, Tuck, Nakamura, Schofield, and King) would have resulted in at least this aspect of amended independent claim 1. Consequently, amended claim 1 and all of the other claims which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 are patentable over any combination or sub-combination of Satoshi, Katta, Felix, Tuck, Nakamura, Schofield, and King.

Applicants submit herewith a petition for a two-month extension, and pay for it by authorization to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, bringing the response period to November 22, 2006. Applicants believe that no additional fees or extensions are required. However, if for any reason the authorized fee is inadequate, the Office is conditionally authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**. Also, the Office should consider this a conditional petition for the proper extension period needed to have this response entered and considered, if the requested period is inadequate.

In view of the foregoing, applicants request reconsideration and allowance.

Dated: November 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 21874

By 
Scott B. Weston

Registration No.: 55,854
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 439-4444
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant